1 2 3 4 5 6 7	PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAT JOHN M. GRENFELL (CA Bar No. 88500) john.grenfell@pillsburylaw.com JACOB R. SORENSEN (CA Bar No. 209134 jake.sorensen@pillsburylaw.com FUSAE NARA (pro hac vice) fusae.nara@pillsburylaw.com ANDREW D. LANPHERE (CA Bar No. 191 andrew.lanphere@pillsburylaw.com 50 Fremont Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 983-1000 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200)	
8 9	Attorneys for Defendants SHARP CORPORATION and SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION		
10			
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
13	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
14		٦	
15	IN RE: TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Master File No. 3:07-md-1827 SI MDL No. 1827	
16			
17	This Document Relates To:	STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED) ORDER EXTENDING SHARP'S TIME	
18	Case No. 2010-CV-3517 SI	TO ANSWER AMENDED	
19 20	STATE OF FLORIDA, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS,	COMPLAINT	
21	Plaintiff,		
22	V.		
23	AU Optronics Corporation, et al.,		
24 25	Defendants.		
26		_	
27			
28			

Case 3:07-md-01827-SI Document 3882 Filed 10/13/11 Page 2 of 3

1	WHEREAS plaintiff State of Florida filed an Amended Complaint in the above-	
2	captioned case against Defendants AU Optronics Corporation, AU Optronics Corporation	
3	America, Chi Mei Innolux Corp., CMO Japan Co., Ltd., Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA,	
4	Inc., Hannstar Display Corporation, Hitachi Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Ltd., Hitachi Electroni	
5	Devices (USA), Inc., LG Display Co., Ltd., LG Display America Inc., Samsung Electronic	
6	Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Semiconductor, Inc., Sharp	
7	Corporation, Sharp Electronics Corporation, Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba Mobile Displa	
8	Technology Co., Ltd., Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc., and Toshiba America	
9	Electronic Components, Inc. on April 13, 2011, Dkt. no. 2652;	
10	WHEREAS Sharp Corporation and Sharp Electronics Corporation (together,	
11	"Sharp"), jointly with other defendants in this action, filed a motion to dismiss the	
12	Amended Complaint on May 20, 2011;	
13	WHEREAS the Court denied defendants' joint motion to dismiss the Amended	
14	Complaint on September 15, 2011;	
15	WHEREAS Sharp desires a reasonable amount of time to answer the Amended	
16	Complaint; and	
17	WHEREAS the requested time modification will not affect any other deadline in	
18	this case.	
19	THEREFORE, the State of Florida and Sharp hereby agree that Sharp's deadline to	
20	answer to the Amended Complaint shall be November 7, 2011.	
21	Dated: October 7, 2011	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

- 1 -

Case 3:07-md-01827-SI Document 3882 Filed 10/13/11 Page 3 of 3

1		OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF
2		THE STATE OF FLORIDA
3		By: /s/ Nicholas J. Weilhammer R. Scott Palmer
		Lizabeth A. Brady
4		Nicholas J. Weilhammer (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Office of the Attorney General
5		State of Florida
6		PL-01, The Capitol
		Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050 (850) 414-3300 (Phone)
7		(850) 488-9134 (Facsimile)
8		Nicholas.weilhammer@myfloridalegal.com
9		PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
9		JOHN M. GRENFELL
10		JACOB R. SORENSEN
11		FUSAE NARA ANDREW D. LANPHERE
11		50 Fremont Street
12		San Francisco, CA 94105
13		
14		By:/s/ John M. Grenfell
		John M. Grenfell
15		Attorneys for Defendants SHARP CORPORATION
16		and SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
17	ATTESTATION: Pursuant to Ge	neral Order 45, Part X-B, the filer attests that the
18	concurrence of the other signatory	hereto has been obtained.
19		
20	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
21		Jusan Mator
22	Dated:10/7/11	Honorable Susan Illston
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		